

**REMARKS**

**I. Overview**

These remarks are set forth in response to the Non-Final Office Action. Presently, claims 1 through 20 are pending in the Patent Application. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are independent in nature. In the Non-Final Office Action, claims 1 through 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0213258 by Ramamoorthy. In response, *Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 9, 11 and 17 and Applicants have canceled claims 2 and 10. Applicants' amendments are directed to the limitation of claim 2 in which it is set forth that the data is "orphaned data". Accordingly, Applicants' amendments have introduced no new matter.*

**II. The Applicants' Invention**

As set forth in Abstract of Applicants' originally filed specification, the Applicant's invention provides a method, system and computer program product for collaborative computing environment access restriction and orphan data management. In an embodiment of Applicants' invention, a data handling policy can be established and implemented in which the data

handling policy for one of a person and a role is stored on a computer storage medium. More particularly, the data handling policy is implemented in the collaborative computing environment by providing access to data--namely orphaned data--in accordance with the established data handling policy. Access to the data handling policy is provided to a person affected by the data handling policy in which the access to the data handling policy includes allowing the affected person to view the data handling policy.

### III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

#### A. Characterization of Ramamoorthy

Ramamoorthy claims a method of implementing a policy of an information technology system. In Ramamoorthy, a requester group that includes different requesters with equal privileges under the policy is formed. A resource group that includes different resources to be accessed by the resource group subject to the policy is formed. Thereafter, the policy is implemented as the requestor group acting upon the resource group.

B. Comparison of Ramamoorthy to the Claims

On page 3 of the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 2 and 10 in reference to paragraph [0030] of Ramamoorthy. Specifically, Examiner stated,

Per claims 2-3, Ramamoorthy teaches granting the user unrestricted access to shared data (see par. 30). It is noted that such data would include any data generated by one or more users.

Claims 2 and 10, however, require with specificity that the data is "orphaned data". Paragraph [0008] of Applicants' specification describe orphaned data as data or content in a system for which a corresponding manager has been deleted from the system. In this regard, paragraph [0008] of Applicants' specification provides:

[0008] An additional problem is created in situations where a person leaves the system or is removed from the collaborative computing system or community, yet has data he/she has created or controls. An example of this scenario occurs when the last manager of the content is deleted from the system. This data is referred to as orphaned data because it becomes data with no owner. Current systems provide one of three solutions for orphaned data. First, orphaned data can be deleted from the system. This solution can obviously be problematic as needed content may be deleted and rendered permanently unavailable. Second, orphaned data can be made available to the person's manager or other designated administrative entity.

The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim term "orphaned data" is data that has been orphaned. There is no teaching in paragraph [0030] of Ramamoorthy that addresses data that has been orphaned. Therefore, not all claimed elements of claims 1 through 20 have been accounted for in

Ramamoorthy. To the extent that the limitation of "orphaned data" has been incorporated into Applicants' independent claims by way of the present amendment, withdrawal of Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

#### IV. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) owing to the amended claims and foregoing remarks. The Applicant requests that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 2, 2010

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg  
Reg. No.: 44,725  
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul  
950 Peninsula Corporate Circle  
Suite 2022  
Boca Raton, Florida 33487  
**Customer No. 46321**  
Tel: (561) 922-3845  
Fax: (561) 244-1062